

REMARKS

The amendment of the claims herein reflects a telephone discussion between Applicant's representative and the Examiner on April 21, 2005.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 20, 23-26 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Greer et al., U.S. patent publication 2001/0011226.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Greer in view of Hoguta et al., U.S. patent 6,725,303.

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Greer.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Greer in view of Hoguta, and further in view of Kwok et al., UK patent publication GB 2,346,239.

Applicant respectfully traverses the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102(c)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 20, 23-26 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by Greer et al., U.S. patent publication 2001/0011226.

6 9 26 31

Since claims 6, 9, 26, and 31 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 6, 9, 26, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is moot.

Applicant respectfully contends that Greer does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 23, because Greer does not teach each and every feature of claims 1, 20 and 23 .

As a first example of why Greer does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 23, Greer does not teach the feature: "acquiring data from each site searched or visited by the user during each session of a plurality of sessions via the public network, **said acquired data comprising content of each site searched or visited during each said session**" (emphasis added). Greer teaches acquiring data relating to visits of a web sites by the user (see Greer FIG. 2 and description thereof in Paragraphs 0014 - 0016), but the acquired data in Greer does not comprise the content of each site as required by claims 1, 20, and 34.

As a second example of why Greer does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 23, Greer does not teach the feature: "parsing the acquired data to identify session attributes for each site searched or visited and associating a session weight with each said session attribute of each site searched or visited, **wherein the session attributes for each site searched or visited are derived from keywords consisting of section headings and bolded words in the acquired data of each site searched or visited**, and wherein each session weight of each site searched or visited is derived from the time spent by the user in each site searched or visited or from a

09/782,933

11

frequency of visits by the user to each site searched or visited" (emphasis added). Applicants note that Greer does not teach said "parsing" and most certainly does not teach that "the session attributes for each site searched or visited are derived from keywords consisting of section headings and bolded words in the acquired data of each site searched or visited".

As a third example of why Greer does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 23, Greer does not teach the feature: "providing a mapping that associates each session attribute with a corresponding user profile attribute". FIG. 4 of Applicant's patent application provides an example of said "mapping", wherein the session attributes (KEYWORDS column) are associated with corresponding user profile attributes (ATTRIBUTE column). Greer does not teach the claimed "mapping".

As a fourth example of why Greer does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 23, Greer does not teach the feature: "for each user profile attribute: determining a user profile weight derived from session weights associated with session attributes corresponding to the user profile attribute in accordance with said mapping". Greer does not teach both "session weights" and "a user profile weight", and Greer most certainly does not teach the preceding feature of claims 1, 20 and 23 which depends of the claimed "mapping" to link the session attributes with corresponding user profile attributes in order to effectuate determining the user profile weight as claimed.

As a fourth example of why Greer does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 23, Greer does not teach the feature: "generating a user profile pertaining to the user, said user profile including one or more attribute records, each attribute record of said one or more attribute records comprising: a user profile attribute of said user profile attributes, the user profile weight associated with the user profile attribute, and the session weights associated with the user profile attribute". The

preceding feature of claims 1, 20, and 23 is reciting a particular formatting of the user profile in terms of records and the content of the records. This claimed format of the user profile is illustrated in Table 3 of Applicant's patent application. Although FIG. 2 of Greer depicts records of a user profile, the records in Greer's user profile do not include all of the content claimed for the records of claims 1, 20 and 23. For example, the records in Greer do not include the session weights (i.e., the session weights are defined earlier in the claim(s) as the weights of each individual web site visited during each session).

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Greer does not anticipate claims 1, 20 and 23, and that claims 1, 20 and 23 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 3-5, 8, and 10 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 3-5, 8, and 10 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 29-30 depend from claim 20, Applicants contend that claims 29-30 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 24-25 depend from claim 23, Applicants contend that claims 24-25 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Greer in view of Hoguta et al., U.S. patent 6,725,303. However, since claim 2 depends from claim 1, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Greer under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicant maintains that claim 2 is likewise not unpatentable over Greer in view of Hoguta under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 27 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Greer. However, since claims 7, 27 and 32 respectively depend from claims 1, 23, and 20, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Greer under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicant maintains that claims 7, 27 and 32 are likewise not unpatentable over Greer under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).


The Examiner rejected claims 11, 22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Greer in view of Hoguta, and further in view of Kwok et al., UK patent publication GB 2,346,239. However, since claims 11, 22 and 28 respectively depend from claims 1, 20, and 23, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Greer under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicant maintains that claims 11, 22 and 28 are likewise not unpatentable over Greer in view of Hoguta and further in view of Kwok under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 04/21/2005

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850



Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688